

Code, to provide that employees of the United States or the District of Columbia called as witnesses in judicial proceedings shall not be charged with loss of salary or authorized leave of absence with pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 8643. A bill prescribing minimum and maximum operation level of Flathead Lake, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8644. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research and education centers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 8645. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 8646. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to eliminate the provisions of section 9 thereof concerning two or more members of a family in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8647. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by

all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children; to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8648. A bill to make permanent the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 8649. A bill to make permanent the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8650. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to provide retention preference to certain blind employees in cases of reductions in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.J. Res. 495. Joint resolution calling upon the motion picture industry to take appro-

priate action to make certain that no damage will be done to the foreign relations of the United States by the showing in foreign countries of movies which misrepresent our Nation or its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 8651. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gaetano Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 8652. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bombace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 8653. A bill for the relief of American President Lines, Ltd., Nitto Shosen Co., Ltd., and Koninklijke Java-China-Paketaan Lijnen N.V. (Royal Inter-ocean Lines); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 8654. A bill for the relief of Harold Meyerberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 8655. A bill for the relief of Patricio Pina-Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Letter to the French Ambassador

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, 1959, a story was published in the press that 16 Members of the House of Representatives urged the French Government to enter into negotiations to end the Algerian war and my name was listed as one of the 16 House Members. I have no knowledge of having signed such statement and do not subscribe to the views as expressed in that statement.

I have informed the French Ambassador that I am not in accord with the contents of the statement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of my letter to the French Ambassador as follows:

AUGUST 13, 1959.

His Excellency Mr. HERVE ALPHAND,  
Ambassador of France,  
French Embassy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Since writing to you on August 4, my attention has been called by my good friend Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, and also by Mr. Joseph M. Levy, that on August 6, 2 days after writing to you such letter lauding President de Gaulle, I allegedly joined 15 other Congressmen in a statement concerning Algeria.

I have no knowledge of signing such letter and am unable to check whether my secretary signed such statement without my knowledge, since she is presently away on vacation.

However, since the contents of such statement has now been made known to me,

I wish to state emphatically that I am not in accord with its contents since it demonstrates interference with the internal and domestic policies of our great ally, the French Republic.

I repeat that, regardless of what my feelings toward France may have been prior to President De Gaulle, I am now convinced and have been since President de Gaulle came into power, that we are dealing with a new France, with a united country under the splendid leadership of a great friend of the United States and a staunch foe of communism.

With warm regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,  
Member of Congress.

### East-West Trade: Advantages and Disadvantages

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the question of expanding trade with the Soviet Union promises to grow larger and larger as the exchange of visits between Soviet and the United States becomes more frequent. It is well known that Russia is anxious for more trade markets in the west, as Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Koslov made clear when they were here. The question is: Would greater trade with Russia be valuable and profitable for us?

A very well-reasoned discussion of this subject may be found in an article writ-

ten for the May issue of *Tradescope* by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who concludes that increased trade can, if handled wisely, "be a net advantage for the United States and the free world."

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "East-West Trade: Advantages and Disadvantages," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Tradescope*, May 1959]

#### EAST-WEST TRADE: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Since earliest times the interchange of goods between nations has exerted a profound influence on the political relations of the trading partners. Political commitments have in turn cast their shadow over trade. This two-way impact is illustrated in the relationship between the Soviet bloc and the free world today. Until quite recently, the leaders of the Soviet Union have avoided extensive exchange of goods with the non-Socialist world economy. On the other hand, the free world has been able to develop only as much trade as the Soviet state-trading system was willing to permit.

During the past 5 years, however, there has been an increasing drive on the part of the Soviet bloc to enter the marketplace of the world. Because of its sudden emergence, it has often been suggested that the current Soviet economic offensive is merely a drive for political advantage with the ultimate aim of dividing the free world. Premier Khrushchev is reported to have said that "trade is not economics, it is power."

In assessing the advantages and disadvantages that might result increasing East-West trade, certain considerations should be noted.

Russia's monolithic trading mechanism with all its geographic subdivisions can con-

centrate with telling effects on strategic objectives and thus challenge the West, precisely because Russia is not concerned with profits or taxes. Its state trading monopoly is in a position not only to sell but also to buy vast quantities of goods or raw materials at a politically propitious moment because price is no object and all attendant costs, such as transportation, are absorbed by the state. Russia and the satellites, who are part of her economic orbit, are not concerned with the wage and price problems of the free enterprise system. This preponderant advantage is strengthened even more because the free world is composed of trading competitors who are also maneuvering for a more profitable share of the world markets. Operating as individual units, they are not fully equipped to meet massive Soviet competition.

Increasing shipments from the West have the effect of assisting the Soviets to overcome weaknesses and deficiencies, and thus inevitably to strengthen their war potential. In the past, however, our refusal to lift the embargo on strategic trade items with the Soviet Union has not proved wholly successful in containing Soviet economic advance. Although our efforts certainly slowed momentarily the economic advance of the Soviet Union, we have failed to deter her. In fact, our limited trade policies have often served to stimulate the Soviets to accelerate development and expand production. This is exactly what happened when we refused to sell aluminum to the Soviet Union immediately after World War II. By concentrated efforts, the Union was not only able to construct plants, but to produce aluminum at sufficient capacity that she was able to place a large volume on the world market last year and break the existing price structure.

The current drive for the easing of restrictions of East-West trade is more in the direction of strengthening the industrial, military, and economic prowess of the Communist bloc. What the Soviet trade agencies want above all, of course, is goods that are strategically important, yet whose export had hitherto been prohibited under our Battle Act. Several of our trading partners have long been under pressure by their business communities to sell such goods to Russia. Thus, ships, power generators, machine tools, presses, mining machinery, communications and transportation equipment are now being sent behind the Iron Curtain as a result of the gradual relaxation of controls. In return the Russians sell and ship grain, fish, and raw materials such as lead, zinc, copper, hides, and fur, plus a small amount of machinery. Underdeveloped areas can use the development equipment, but any deal with the industrialized West always includes a request for capital goods.

#### OBJECTIVES OF RUSSIA'S TRADE OFFENSIVE

It seems as if the aim of Russia's trade offensive is to attract the smaller nations (underdeveloped areas with major raw material exports) into its commercial orbit, while at the same time undermining the competitive position of Western trading nations. Thus Russia has had enormous success in buying up the pressing surpluses of Finland, Burma, Iceland, Egypt, Uruguay, and Argentina. The West has been unable to step up its own small programs of exclusive buying simply because of the Russian advantage whereby its trade monopoly can engineer deals without regard to the usual commercial terms, prices, or quality. This initial advantage and the willingness to engage in such large-scale buying have been pressed to the point of establishing commercial dominance. In the countries where aggressive export campaigns have been waged, Russia has succeeded in capturing a large percentage of that country's import market, notably Afghanistan 30 percent, Finland 20 percent, Egypt 20 percent, and Iceland 22 percent.

Trading relations with the industrialized West are beginning to resemble increasingly the trade between Old Russia and Europe—fundamentally, the exchange of Russian foodstuffs and raw materials for manufactured goods. Her enormous industrialization plan necessitates increasingly larger supplies of specialized machinery—for example, the colossal extension of her chemical industry depends on Western machinery. Trade in these items cannot depend on barter deals, but requires hard currencies and gold. To earn the hard currency the Russians are concentrating on the supply and export in very specific sectors—like scientific instruments for schools—of a quality and at prices that cannot be met by the United States of America.

The West may be willing to trade with the Soviets, but certain difficulties have to be overcome. Notably foreign customers' unfamiliarity with Soviet products; the West's lack of knowledge of Soviet suppliers; the problem of service and spare parts; the known Russian stand against the extension of commercial credit to private foreign buyers; the dependability of performance on deliveries; and finally the question of whether trade relations may not be severed at will by the Russian political leaders if they wish to switch to more promising markets in line with their political objectives.

#### THE VOLUME OF SOVIET TRADE

The Soviet Union is now making a conspicuous effort to increase its commercial range outside the Communist bloc. By deliberate policy, three-fourths of all trade is reserved for its Communist trade partners. Since 1953, trade with the outside world has been gaining in volume. Measured by the extra-orbit portion of her trade, Russia is not a very important trading nation. To cite one figure, annual exports to all free countries at present amount to about \$1 billion. In terms of rank among trading nations, this puts her in our hemisphere somewhat ahead of Argentina but behind Brazil. In Europe, the size of Russia's annual volume of exports, excluding the bloc countries, places her somewhat between Austria and Denmark.

Russia's largest trade partners outside the bloc are the following six countries: Finland, United Kingdom, Egypt, West Germany, India, and France. To the first of this group, Finland, the value of annual exports in 1957 amounted to \$150 million; to the last, France, \$67 million. With the United States, the volume of trade conducted is a negligible affair. Soviet exports to the United States amounted to only \$16 million in 1957.

The important thing to note is that the Soviet Government has undergone a change of heart toward trade. It no longer considers it a strategic liability. In recent years, it has been able to expand its trade all along the three main lines of geographic distribution, namely with the bloc nations, with the industrialized nations of the West, and with the underdeveloped countries. The latter, it is true, are, for the most part, a new element in Soviet trade. Yet, as mentioned above, two of Russia's principal trade partners outside the bloc are underdeveloped nations, Egypt and India.

#### ADVANTAGES OF EAST-WEST TRADE

An important fact to bear in mind is that the movement of trade between East and West continued as a fairly active race during the worst years of the postwar period. The natural resources of the East have always exerted a strong commercial pull upon the West. This is especially true in Europe. The East possesses a variety of raw material needed in the West. Russia and her satellites are in a surplus position in forest products, fertilizer, fuels, flax, a number of minerals, and they regularly export a wide variety of foodstuffs, ranging from grain to eggs.

At the same time, the countries of the East have always served as an outlet for

industrial products from the West. In many areas of technology, especially in the less strategic industries, Western producers have always appreciated the opportunity to broaden their market potential by keeping open the door to the East. True, it is an extremely unpredictable market. They buy at the margin, and they usually buy basic types of production equipment on a one-shot basis, but even a single sale of this sort, from the standpoint of the manufacturer, can be a large, profitable transaction. Above all, a channel for cooperation in a peaceful field.

One aspect of this problem is often overlooked. Rising living standards in the Soviet Union, resulting from increased trade, or other factors, may make a contribution to peace and may ultimately help to moderate the Communist dictatorship itself. As consumer aspirations are increasingly realized, it will become more difficult for the Soviet people to accept as valid the official image of the West as their mortal enemy. They will be more inclined to see the United States for what it is. A growing professional-managerial class may be a force for moderation as it balances the power of the military and political elites. I do not believe in economic determinism, but I do believe that economic factors influence the character of political institutions.

In conclusion, I support an increased volume of East-West trade because, if handled wisely, I believe it can be a net advantage for the United States and the free world. There is little risk in expanding the volume of nonstrategic trade. In addition to the mutual economic values deriving from such an exchange of goods there are certain non-economic byproducts which may be even more important. Trade always means person-to-person contact, and sometimes means idea-to-idea contact, among the trading partners. Such contact may lead to greater political understanding. We should neither underestimate nor overestimate the contribution of international commerce to international peace, but in these days of serious conflict let us not arbitrarily close any door to the greater exchange of goods, persons, or ideas.

### Louisiana Champion, From Lafayette, Competing in National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o Here

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am justly proud of the fact that the Louisiana champion in this week's finals of the National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o, taking place here in Washington, is from my congressional district. He is 17-year-old Bill Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. Pierre Young, of Lafayette, La.

The winner of the Louisiana title is competing with representatives from the other States in the written and skill phases of this contest sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Accompanying him to the Nation's Capital is Second Vice President Cary Moore, of the Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce, son of Mr. William Moore, Sr., of that city. The Louisiana finals of the road-e-o were



conducted in Jefferson Parish—county—where approximately 50 young people, winners in the local contests conducted by the various junior chambers of commerce throughout the State participated.

The written tests this week have been given at the Statler-Hilton Hotel and the skill events staged at the National Guard Armory. First, second, and third place national winners will receive scholarships worth \$2,000, \$1,500, and \$1,000, respectively, during the presentation of awards at a banquet Thursday night.

Among the events arranged for the contestants during their stay here was a visit to the White House where Bill Young was photographed standing next to the President.

The Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce, with a membership of around 40 young men active in community affairs, sponsors numerous civic events in addition to the safe driving competition which is open to both boys and girls. The organization, formed several years ago, meets for a luncheon program on the first Wednesday of each month and gathers for a night meeting on the third Wednesday. The officers are headed by President Carroll Baudoin and the others, in addition to Cary Moore, are Alvin O'Fleruity, first vice president; Scotty Brane, treasurer; and Gerry Bush, secretary.

### A Letter From the White House: No Invitation to Chou En-lai

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CHARLES O. PORTER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence between myself and the President and a brief statement which I issued to the press today:

AUGUST 4, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I agree with you that an exchange of visits between you and Premier Khrushchev may create better understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union and thereby promote the cause of peace. It seems to me that the cause of peace could be promoted for exactly the same reasons if you and Chou En-lai were to exchange visits.

China, like the Soviet Union, is more enemy than friend. China's internal hate campaign against the United States is well known, as are China's aggressions in Korea and against Taiwan. But surely, if better understanding might lead to peace between us and the Soviet Union, we should at least attempt better understanding through visitor exchanges with China, at all levels, to promote the cause of peace in this area.

Of course this involves recognition of China. This can be done without turning "soft." Recognition does not mean forgiveness or approval. William Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, wrote me July 31, 1959:

"As I have mentioned in previous letters to you the fact that we maintain normal diplomatic relations with a particular country does not imply that we approve or disapprove of its internal policies or practices."

Your hopes and efforts, applauded by almost everyone, to achieve the end of nuclear tests require that we recognize China. No feasible inspection agreement can be concluded without the participation of China, the world's largest and most populous nation.

Considering your great responsibilities and the state of your health, your agreement to go to Europe and to the Soviet Union may very well rule out a trip by you to China in the near future. With this in mind, and with deep admiration for your selfless decision to make the trips to Europe and the Soviet Union, I offer this alternative suggestion: That you encourage visitor exchange on other levels. I refer particularly to Members of Congress, journalists, national leaders, teachers, and students.

Such visitor exchanges with China might also lead to better understanding which would promote peaceful relations with China just as we are now trying to do with the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,  
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 7, 1959.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Thank you for your letter. I am glad to have your suggestion that I exchange visits with Chou En-lai, as well as your view that we should afford recognition to Red China.

I cannot agree with you that it would be desirable for this country to give diplomatic recognition to Communist China or for me to invite Chou En-lai to visit this country. So long as the balance of advantage lies in maintaining our present policies in the Far East, I believe we should not change them. I believe these policies best serve the cause of peace.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES O. PORTER, DEMOCRAT, OF OREGON, AUGUST 12, 1959

I appreciate the President's personal attention to my letter. However, I regret that the only matter of substance was his flat assumption that "the balance of advantage lies in maintaining our present policies in the Far East." On the basis of this reasoning the President apparently believes that "the balance of advantage" has tipped the wrong way with respect to the Soviet Union. That is presumably why he has invited Khrushchev to visit us, but not Chou En-lai. In my opinion the President holds no such views but they would naturally follow from his letter to me.

The President did not comment on my statement that visitor exchanges at all levels with China could promote peace just as the existing and expanding visitor exchange program with the Soviet Union promotes better understanding and peace.

Nor does the President suggest how we can achieve an end to nuclear weapons testing unless China subscribes to the inspection agreement.

While it is virtually unique, as well as an honor and a pleasure, to receive a letter from the President, and while it is gratifying to know he has personally considered this important matter, I would rather have received a more responsive letter from one of his assistants. Disputed issues of this magnitude need responsive and responsible discussion.

### Report by Senator Saltonstall to People of Massachusetts

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the United States is a proud Nation today—proud of its democracy, proud of its industry and especially proud of its people—of the rights of the individual.

Mr. President, we must remain ever on guard to see that this Nation remains interested in the individual and that we remain and grow as a Nation of the thrifty and hard-working. Of recent interest has been the proposal to broaden the number of those who are able to provide for their old age and declining years through their personal efforts rather than through Government means.

We now have industrial and corporate pension plans where in a perfectly proper way employers provide for the retirement of their employees—showing concern for them as individuals. But, Mr. President, we must show that same concern for those individuals not covered by corporate pension plans. Feeling as I do on this subject, Mr. President, I recently wrote a report to my constituents in Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### INDEPENDENCE—THE AMERICAN WAY

The foundation of the great democracy we enjoy in the United States is the respect our citizens hold for each other as individuals.

Starting with our Declaration of Independence representatives chosen by our people have sought to build upon that foundation.

Congress has always sought to keep the balance of equal respect for all individuals.

At the present time a source of unbalance is the law surrounding the ability of each individual to provide for his own security in later years.

The law now provides, for example, that employers may set up pension plans for their employees. An employer can deduct the annual payments as a business expense. The employee is not taxed until he receives the pension in later years. Thus the whole amount is not taxed to either employer or employee for an interim period. This legislation has led to the establishment of many corporate pension funds and even to a few set up by partnerships and individual employers.

But this law omits the person who works for himself. This man, independent and self-supporting, deserves equal treatment under the law, for his enterprise has contributed greatly to our country's growth.

Our self-employed persons are the backbone of the country. They include the highly trained professional people, many of the master mechanics, small businessmen who own their own commercial establishments, and some manufacturers. From these people come many of the ideas and efforts that help build our country.

At present they are not permitted tax deductions to set aside funds for their retire-

ment even though they are, in essence, their own employers and might be doing it for their employees.

President Eisenhower recognized the problem when as a candidate in 1952 he said, "When this legislation was being considered, self-employed individuals were evidently forgotten, yet they get old and sick just as other people do." Later, in his state of the Union message in 1953, he stated that encouragement of pension plans for private individuals should be an important part of the legislative program.

Since then little has been done, unfortunately to put this request into effect.

A bill now before the Senate Finance Committee which passed the House of Representatives would correct a large part of this deficiency in the present law.

H.R. 10 provides that self-employed persons can set aside, in an irrevocable trust, up to \$2,500 per year. This amount will be deductible from gross income for purposes of income tax for the year the money was received, but will be considered taxable income upon retirement. The rate of tax at retirement will probably be substantially less, since the individual will no longer have taxable earned income. The bill sets up certain conditions as to the type of fund into which the money is put and restrictions as to the conditions under which any of the funds thus set aside can be withdrawn.

The Senate Committee on Finance scheduled another hearing on this bill for August 11, and there is no way of determining at this time whether it or a similar bill will be reported by the Committee for Senate action. One reason for this has been the Treasury Department's opposition. The Treasury has been concerned that the tax relief offered will decrease the Federal revenue and put the budget out of balance.

It correctly believes that the inflation caused by the deficit financing arising from an unbalanced budget will in effect weaken the retirement programs of all of us—employed as well as self-employed.

I believe the Treasury must work to find a way whereby a positive approach can be taken to correct the inequity in our present law, as the legislation basically is extremely important and only fair to large numbers of our citizens. To avoid an unbalanced budget the Treasury Department must seek alternative revenue thereby avoiding deficit dangers.

The Treasury Department, in its opposition to H.R. 10 has stated that it believes: (1) that it might cost the Federal Government \$300 million in tax revenue the first year, (2) that the bill is not fairly written, for although it corrects some of the inequities in our present setup, it does not correct them all, (3) that if the inequities were corrected it might reduce Federal revenue as much as \$3 billion.

Advocates of the bill have stated that they believe it will reduce revenue by only \$100 million and that although it may not correct all of the inequities the opportunity to correct some of them should not be lost.

The principle of this legislation is too important to be lost through a difference over the way in which it should be put into effect. It may be possible that by judicious amendment of the present legislation much can be accomplished to correct many of the inequities.

As far as the loss of revenue to the Treasury is concerned, both sides are talking about substantial sums of money. To this a reasonable answer must be found. But since this matter has already dragged on for so many years, the best thing would be to get the principle of a self-employed retirement fund program established as soon as possible. The revenue loss to the Treasury could be arranged so that the Treasury would have a period of time to build up the alternative revenue sources.

The United States has too long depended upon its self-employed not to continue to encourage them today. The self-employed of this Nation are hardworking people. They will continue to be so but we must not discriminate against them.

I look forward to action on H.R. 10 or its equivalent, and hope that the Finance Committee can report a bill before the end of this session. Too much depends upon this matter of principle. The people have demanded it; an inequity exists that must be corrected.

The individual and individual opportunity have been part of our proudest heritage in this democracy. H.R. 10 helps fulfill this principle.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

## The Impact of Science on Our Society

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an address which I delivered at the 96th commencement of Bryant College on July 31, 1959. The address is entitled "The Impact of Science on Our Society":

#### THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON OUR SOCIETY

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, Veterans Memorial Auditorium, Providence, R.I., at the 96th commencement of Bryant College)

Gathered here this morning are several hundreds of young men and women who have successfully met another in the long series of challenges by which each human being is measured, from his first learned response to his last influence before or after his death.

Gathered here, too, are several thousands of men, women, and children for whom this commencement also signifies the successful meeting of a challenge. For the award of a diploma to an individual is not just tangible recognition of that individual's academic accomplishments; it is also, symbolically, recognition of the accomplishment of parents and loved ones who have given much of themselves in order that a new and potentially valuable member may be added to the family of man.

Bryant College has witnessed many occasions such as this. Thousands of students have studied here and, enlightened and enriched by the experience, gone on to productive, rewarding careers. For nearly a century, the college has been a source of pride to the community it serves by blending specialized education in business techniques and administration with the more general education required for useful citizenship in our complex and dynamic society. It has had the vision and courage to pioneer in educational methods and curriculum. Yet it has never lost sight of its primary mission: To educate the individual.

The educated individual is the key factor governing the strength and effectiveness of our democracy. The incredibly rapid sweep of events in the 20th century places a special responsibility on all of us, not only to keep abreast of our times, but in a sense to keep ahead of our times. This is nowhere more evident than in the field of science. That is why I have chosen

to share with you today some thoughts on science and its impact on society.

What image do you have in your mind when you think of the term "science"? Is it the picture of nuclear power for instruments of peace and weapons of destruction? Is it manned missiles encircling the earth or exploring the surfaces of the moon? Is it probing the depths of the ocean, the molecular structure of metals, the chemistry of the cells of the human body?

This is the kind of image most people have when they think of science. They endow science with qualities that tend to remove it from the society it serves—to set it apart as something mysterious and almost frightening in its potential for engendering sudden and unpredictable change in our way of life. In the same vein, scientists are commonly viewed as obsessively motivated, highly intellectual, socially naive individuals who spend their lives satisfying their intense curiosity to understand the phenomena of the world and the universe about them.

Such images tend to create barriers to public understanding of science, and public understanding is essential if science is to be an even more effective force for the achievement of goals that are set by society.

Textbooks tell us that the essence of science is the facts or principles or rules which are used to explain or hold together what man knows, and to help him discover what he still does not know. The abstract sciences deal with things that cannot be touched, like numbers or thoughts; the natural sciences deal with things in nature, such as men and stones and stars; and the human or social sciences deal with the way we think and act, alone or together. No matter how it is classified, however, science is characterized by what is known as the scientific method. And the application of the scientific method to the study of man and his universe has been a primary force directing and conditioning the growth of civilization as we know it.

It is easy for us today to look back over those relatively few years in which man on this planet has recorded his history and see how primitive science has evolved into modern science. The use of metals—the control of fire, the domestication of animals, the planting and harvesting of crops, the discovery of the wheel, the invention of written language—these were scientific accomplishments which had a marked effect on the subsequent history of mankind.

In the forward movement of science through the intervening centuries—movement associated with such names as Aristotle, Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton—there is evidence of a characteristic of science that must be understood by all of us who live today in a world that is rapidly becoming a scientific world. This characteristic is, if you will, the fallibility of science. It is the only source of knowledge whose truth can be tested by experiment. Its methods and results must be reliable or they are discarded. But what is called scientific truth is not, and must not be thought to be, always absolute and final. Often the information on which scientific conclusions are based is incomplete. Thus scientific knowledge is continually growing and continuously being revised. Science cannot answer, and it is not the answer to, all of the questions of society. It cannot tell all about man, where he came from or where he is going. It cannot tell all about the universe. And while we build and strengthen science because we expect it to build and strengthen our society, it is important that we recognize both the limitations of science and the dangers it brings along with its many blessings.

I shall not try to summarize the ways science affects our daily life. Directly and indirectly, it has made us richer—not only in material and technological miracles that



are accepted as commonplace, but in leisure time, tools for study, and opportunity to create things of beauty. The tempo of scientific discovery in the 20th century has been incredibly rapid. All sciences have moved forward and literally hundreds of new sciences have been generated. Terms like supersonics, thermodynamics, plastics, biochemistry, nuclear physics and astronautics become meaningful parts of our vocabulary. And we invest heavily in programs seeking greater control of power, new forms of matter, freedom from hunger and disease. Yes, science is a dominant force in our society. Its evidences are everywhere—in our homes, in our industrial and agricultural economy, in our transportation and communications systems, in our communities, in our places of work and of learning. One has only to think of the ways science and scientific advances have influenced your own chosen field of business administration and practices to realize the extent to which science is interwoven into the total fabric of our society.

We tend to think of the product and influence of science in positive terms. But just as in the scientific process each major advance highlights other scientific problems that require solution, so the total forward movement of our scientifically oriented society is threatened by dangers which must be recognized and met.

Can we, for example, find ways to use for human betterment the powers that science has given us for weapons of destruction?

Can we use our advanced communications systems to achieve the kind of understanding that will lead to peace among the peoples of the earth?

Is there a solution for the situation which find some nations producing in excess of their nutritional needs while other nations are starving?

Although science can make nearly everything necessary for life out of certain raw materials, not all nations have a supply of these raw materials. Can we learn to share them so that no nation will have to go to war to win its share of needed substances? Moreover, there are just so many raw materials in the earth and no more. Can science find substitutes for old sources of energy before the earth's resources are depleted?

Can we find certain ways to protect ourselves against the environmental hazards and stresses that we ourselves have created?

Can we eliminate or bring under control the diseases that cause crippling and premature death?

Is there a way for society to manage its affairs so that everybody has an equal chance? Can economic and social and political forces learn how to avoid peaks and depressions in a total economy?

These are the kinds of challenges we face. Under a broad and comprehensive definition of science, they are scientific challenges—or, more precisely, challenges in the ultimate application of the scientific method.

Whether the challenges will be met is dependent upon man himself. Man lifted himself above the level of animals because he alone, of all the forms of life on earth, was able, by thought and work, to gain control over the forces of nature. He lifted himself from savagery and barbarism to civilization. This has not been a steady gradual process. Social organization and moral ideals have lagged behind the control over nature. We must use all of our talents and capacities to bridge the great gap that exists between the scientific accomplishments of man and his much less advanced social thinking and action.

This is one of the reasons why the individual and his education are of such critical importance today. For each individual member of our society is a precious resource, to be nurtured, challenged, and given every opportunity to make a contribution to the solution of the great and small problems

that beset society as it moves ahead to meet—as I know it will meet—the challenges that lie ahead.

There are many ways in which the functions of an elected representative of the people to the Federal Government permit him to contribute to the achievement of the goals we all share. I, for example, have served the people of the Second District of Rhode Island for nearly two decades in the House of Representatives. There are three general ways in which that responsibility is reflected in my actions.

First, it is my responsibility to act for and on behalf of the people of my district. This means I must know them, their views, and their wishes, and faithfully reflect them on all matters of interest to my constituency.

Second, it is my responsibility to take an active and informed part in all matters of national and international consequence. In this sense, each elected representative serves the people of the Nation as a whole, as well as his own constituents.

Finally, it is my special responsibility to review and recommend appropriations for the activities of two departments of the executive branch—the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This committee assignment gives me an opportunity to study in depth the work of many Federal agencies that have a direct and personal effect on the lives of all of us. Out of the complex of activities in these Departments, I have chosen to mention here today two that bear on my topic "The Impact of Science on Society."

Within the U.S. Office of Education, there has recently come into being a program which loans funds to brilliant young students in order to help them acquire higher education in the physical sciences. Called the National Defense Education Act and now in its second year, this program will help recruit and train a number of young people for careers in one segment of our Nation's total scientific endeavor.

While I gave my support to this program, and would do so again under the present circumstances, I know I will not be misunderstood if I say I wish it had not been necessary for this legislation to be enacted.

In the first place, such emergency programs are always less efficient and effective than the orderly and sustained growth in depth and in strength of the total educational system. A nation such as ours should be well able to afford a system of elementary, secondary, and higher education which would have the capacity routinely to meet our national needs; more than this, we cannot afford not to have such a system. But there are grave present inadequacies in our educational system—inadequacies which threaten to become critical deficits in the years ahead. Our educational facilities are being outdistanced by population growth and change. The salaries and other compensations for teachers are not commensurate with their services, and the teacher shortage becomes increasingly acute. And higher education is fast becoming out of reach for too many of our young men and women who should have an opportunity for such education.

The crisis in education is a local, State, and national problem. The public has a right to expect vigorous, enlightened leadership from Washington so that our full resources can be directed to its solution. I regret to say that such leadership has not been forthcoming. The administration has toyed with the problem but has backed away from any affirmative action. As a result, little bits of the problem—like the special impetus to science education to which I just referred—have been touched. But the heart of the problem remains, and will remain until the people of the United States decide how much importance they attach to sound education and make their views known to their representatives in government at all levels.

A second scientific activity of the Federal Government with which I am closely associated is medical research. In this activity, I am happy to be able to report that the public interest is being well served. During the past 15 years, there has been gratifying and sustained growth in the Nation's investment in medical research, with about equal support from Federal and non-Federal sources. What began in 1946 as a spotty, uncertain program has emerged into a comprehensive, stable, productive effort of which every citizen can be proud. We are now able to provide for the needs of most of the competent scientists who have sound research ideas and work in an established research environment. At the same time, recognizing that investments in science are long-term investments, we have an active program for the advanced training of medical research scientists and another to assist in the construction of medical research facilities.

I am proud to say that my name is closely linked with that part of this effort which has Federal origin, particularly the National Institutes of Health, a bureau of the U.S. Public Health Service in Bethesda, Md. I have supported this program because of my deeply rooted conviction that the health of our people has a direct correlation with the strength, well-being, and productivity of our Nation—a conviction that has been borne out by the progress that has been made since we embarked on a renewed medical research activity after World War II.

There are all sorts of objective measures of the advances which have occurred when knowledge derived from medical research has been applied in medical and public health practice. There are increases in life expectancy. There are diseases that can be prevented, conditions that can be ameliorated or cured, lives that can be saved. In the health sciences as in the other sciences, an endless succession of ever more complex problems stretches out ahead. But we can be glad that we have taken and are taking and will take the necessary steps to assure that one by one, as scientific knowledge permits, the major health issues of today will crumble before the diversified and brilliant attack of our medical research workers. Perhaps not in my lifetime, but almost certainly in yours, we will see better ways to prevent or cure cancer, better ways to control heart disease, better ways to protect against and treat certain of the mental illnesses.

It is this thought—this awareness of the intimate relationship between medical research and the people's health, and between science and the fulfillment of man's total aspirations—that I would leave with you today.

You who are being honored here for the completion of your work at Bryant College have essential roles in our complex world of tomorrow. Science has made all of us world citizens. It has enlarged our spheres of activity so that neither we, our community, nor our Nation can be in fact separate or independent. This places a high premium on the responsibility of society to provide an opportunity for each of its individual members to reach his full potential. And it emphasizes the responsibility of the individual to use his full potential for the betterment of the society of which he is a part.

To you who are graduating from this fine institution—best wishes in whatever you do in the years ahead. You have been well educated here. Use your education.

To your parents and friends who have come here this morning because they love you, are proud of your accomplishment, and would not willingly be anywhere else when you are being singled out for recognition—to them, congratulations for a different kind of accomplishment, a kind you will

understand better when it is your sons and daughters who are graduating from college.

To those who administer and instruct at Bryant College—a special word of gratitude. There is no finer contribution that an individual can make than to educate.

And to all of you—students, parents, staff, and friends—may I convey the abiding respect and confidence that is shared by all who have reason to know Bryant College and its graduates. The people of Providence and of Rhode Island are proud of Bryant's long and distinguished service and are proud, too, that it is numbered among this little State's large family of educational institutions.

I am sure that those who are graduating today will do honor to Bryant College as, in their work and in their daily lives, they reflect what they have learned here.

### World Coffee Production

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 12, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the results of two recent surveys on world coffee production and U.S. coffee consumption are of great interest to those of us concerned with inter-American trade relations.

These surveys were published by the Pan-American Coffee Bureau, an instrument of 13 Latin American coffee-producing nations. One survey relates to coffee consumption in this country, the largest coffee importing nation in the world, from 1950 to 1959.

The studies are detailed and authoritative. The bureau has published its annual statistical review of world coffee trade for the past 22 years. It has conducted regular surveys of U.S. coffee consumption since 1950. This year, the U.S. survey was made by an independent research agency, Corby Research Service of New Rochelle, N.Y.

The report on coffee consumption by the people of the United States is a study in depth of the current market in this country. It reveals that since 1950 our people have increased their coffee drinking by 100 million cups a day, from 290 to 390 million. It further shows that 75 percent of our population, 10 years of age or over, now drinks coffee on an average of four cups a day.

The report states that the most striking increase in U.S. coffee drinking in the past decade is a spectacular rise of 100 percent in the number of cups being drunk between meals—that is, during coffee breaks. The coffee break has become well established as a national institution and now accounts for 28 percent of our total coffee consumption.

Americans between the ages of 30 and 40 comprise the largest category of coffee drinkers, according to the report, consuming an average of more than four cups daily. On a regional basis, the far West leads the Nation in its coffee consumption, followed by the Midwest, the East, and the South.

For the inveterate coffee drinker, the most interesting aspect of this study re-

lates to what might be termed the "quality gap" between U.S. coffee consumption and U.S. coffee use. While we now consume 35 percent more coffee than we did 10 years ago, we are using only 10 percent more pounds. This means, according to the report, that "Americans are drinking a much weaker brew—than the average cup of coffee being served in U.S. homes today is being brewed at a rate of nearly 65 cups to the pound, whereas the recommended rate for the best flavor and maximum body is 40 cups to the pound."

The report explains that the trend toward weak coffee began a few years ago when coffee prices were high and has not yet reversed itself, even though coffee prices are again at 1950 levels or below. In this connection, the survey also points out that while wholesale and retail coffee prices are back to 1950 levels, 87 percent of all eating places now charge a dime per cup, while in 1950 more than half charged a nickel.

All of this is, of course, interesting sociological data, but it is more. For those concerned with inter-American trade relations and the economic welfare of our hemisphere, these statistics have a special significance. This can best be illustrated by relating the information supplied in the U.S. report to that included in the Bureau's statistical review of world coffee trade.

During 1958, the world review informs us, six Latin American countries relied on coffee for more than half of their foreign currency receipts. For Guatemala, Haiti, and El Salvador, the proportion last year exceeded 70 percent. For Colombia, 85 percent. And for Brazil, which in a recent year obtained almost 70 percent of its foreign trade receipts from coffee exports, the 1958 level fell to 55 percent, due to relatively low shipments.

To further realize the dependence of our Latin American coffee-producing neighbors on U.S. imports and consumption, consider these economic factors:

First. In terms of dollar volume, coffee remains the most valuable agricultural commodity imported into this country, ranking second only to petroleum products in total import value.

Second. Of total world exports of 36½ million bags of coffee in 1958, the United States imported approximately 20 million. Latin American producing nations supplied 72 percent of the world total and 85 percent of the U.S. total.

Third. In turn, Latin American coffee-producing nations comprised nearly 20 percent of the total U.S. export market, purchasing nearly \$3½ billion worth of merchandise from this country.

Fourth. Because nearly a million more tons of coffee were grown than were consumed last year, foreign exchange earnings of the Latin American producing nations continued to decline, since coffee accounts for an average of 24 percent of the exchange earnings of the area.

Fifth. Between 1957 and 1958 the decline in dollar earnings from U.S. imports from Pan American Coffee Bureau nations amounted to nearly \$205 mil-

lion. As the report points out, where this reduction occurred in countries depending heavily on dollar earnings, and where it was relatively substantial, the result in hemispheric trade relations was more balance-of-payments and internal fiscal difficulties.

However, the report states, despite overproduction and accumulating surpluses of green coffee, an orderly market was maintained during 1958 through concerted action by all of the Latin American producing countries. Credit is given here to the operation of the Latin American Coffee Agreement, which went into effect October 1, 1958.

These two reports shed light on Latin American coffee's role as the indispensable denominator of inter-American trade and a healthy hemispheric economy. If any conclusion is to be drawn from these studies, it is that the United States, as the world's largest coffee importer and as the good neighbor of Central and South America, has a definite stake in the efforts being made to solve the growing world coffee crisis.

We cannot stand detached while the economies of 15 Western Hemisphere nations struggle for stability and survival, nor can we safely adhere to a wait-and-see attitude. For, as I have said before, events are moving swiftly in Latin America, and our own self-interest dictates that we must anticipate rather than react to consequences.

Our Latin American coffee-producing neighbors have taken giant strides with considerable sacrifice toward solving their dilemma. But it is not simply their problem, it is ours as well. Only through an active interest in this problem and through continued cooperation can we of the United States maintain the symbol of coffee as the cup of friendship in the Americas.

### Religious and Racial Discrimination Amendment to Mutual Security Appropria- tion Bill, H.R. 8385

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WAYNE MORSE**

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, August 12, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I testified, together with the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], in support of my amendment to the mutual security appropriation bill, H.R. 8385. My amendment deals with the elimination of religious and racial discrimination on the part of any country which enters into mutual security agreements with the United States. As the debate on this matter previously showed, Saudi Arabia, Norway, and Iceland, for example, follow discriminatory practices against some Americans because of their race, religious faith, or color.

This matter was before the Senate when my amendment to the mutual security authorization bill was defeated by



a vote of 47 to 43, although I am satisfied that a considerable number of Senators who voted against my amendment did so, as they have told me since, because they were not aware of the importance of the amendment.

I thought I owed it to the Committee on Appropriations—and the Senators from New York agreed with my position procedurally—to offer the amendment in committee for the committee's consideration, so that when it reached the floor later, if it were not adopted by the committee, the argument could not be raised that the amendment had not been offered in committee.

My testimony speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony I offered in the Committee on Appropriations in support of my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. While I was in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning, and not in the Committee on Appropriations, at the time the able Senator from Oregon spoke, I did attend the latter part of the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations. I took occasion to read the printed comments of the Senator from Oregon. I think they present as excellent and as persuasive a document as I have read with respect to any given issue. I merely desired to have the Senator from Oregon know my reaction.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from California very, very much.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 12, 1959, ON RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, H.R. 8385

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee to urge acceptance of an amendment to the mutual security appropriations bill which will put the Congress of the United States on record in opposition to any policy by our Government which acquiesces in discrimination against American citizens on the grounds of their race or religion.

The U.S. Senate is firmly opposed to such discriminatory practices, I am convinced. The question is whether this is the legislative time and place to raise this issue. My answer is that it is always appropriate to raise this issue, and it is especially appropriate when we are discussing a measure to strengthen the United States and the free world.

The adoption of the amendment I now propose will make for a stronger America. It will make clear to the world that we mean it when we say we are a Nation of free men dedicated to the preservation of human rights and the dignity of man.

The language of the amendment I ask you to adopt reads as follows:

"It is the sense of Congress that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act should be used for furnishing assistance to any nation which as a matter of declared policy or practice, as determined by the President, creates distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other

rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally."

This amendment is modeled on the Lehman resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Senate on July 25, 1956. That resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and

"Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle."

The Lehman resolution was adopted because of the widespread revulsion in this country against our Government's toleration of discriminatory practices by certain Near East countries against American Jews. There was particular concern over our agreement with Saudi Arabia which permitted that country to bar American soldiers of Jewish faith from a base which our country maintained at Dhahran.

All of you are familiar with these facts. I am confident that there is universal disapproval of this policy of exclusion and discrimination. Certainly no one in the administration or in the Congress would want to defend this policy on the ground of principle or morality.

It is interesting to note that after the Lehman resolution was adopted unanimously by the Senate in 1956, both the major political parties adopted strong planks on this issue at their national conventions in the summer of that year.

The Democrats said at Chicago:

"We oppose, as contrary to American principles, the practice of any government which discriminates against American citizens on grounds of race or religion. We will not countenance any arrangement or treaty with any government which by its terms or in its practical application would sanction such practices."

And the Republicans said at San Francisco:

"We approve appropriate action to oppose the imposition by foreign governments of discrimination against U.S. citizens, based on their religion or race."

The language of both statements is clear and forthright. It is regrettable that in too many instances those fine statements constitute mere words.

The U.S. agreement with Saudi Arabia, which was negotiated in 1952, was to expire early in 1957. There was every reason to hope, in view of the Senate resolution and the declaration of both the political parties, that the administration would say to the Saudi Arabian Government, firmly and honestly, that this was a reciprocal agreement conferring benefits on both parties; that it obligated each to respect the other, and that we could no longer accept an arrangement which contradicts the fundamental American principle that all Americans are entitled to the equal protection of the law in the United States. We hoped that we would tell Saudi Arabia that the United States could not permit any country to degrade any American into second-class citizenship.

King Saud came to Washington in 1957. He was given a most unusual welcome. President Eisenhower went to the airport to receive him personally. It is true, of course, that he did not receive a red carpet reception in New York City, a fact which displeased him, but which should not have surprised him too much since so many people who live in New York would not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia on any kind of a carpet.

It is to be regretted that the agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia in respect to the Dhahran Air Base extended another 5 years without providing for the termination of these offensive anti-Jewish screening procedures. It has been stated that we made some protest to Saudi Arabia—but the King was in no mood to defer to our concern. As the late Secretary Dulles told the press at a conference on April 23, 1957:

"We brought up the matter \* \* \* during the talks that took place when King Saud was here. I did not find his attitude at that moment very receptive, largely perhaps \* \* \* because of the fact that he felt that he had not been given nondiscriminatory treatment himself in the city of New York."

But, the new agreement went much further than the old. For we now agreed to extend substantial economic and military aid to Saudi Arabia. We agreed to train Saudi Arabian pilots and naval personnel and to expand the port at Damman.

In following this course of action, we renewed and confirmed an offensive and un-American arrangement. We made possible the practice of discrimination against Americans overseas and, in certain instances, the abridging of the rights of American citizens here in the United States.

This was an abysmal surrender of principle, an abasement unworthy of our country, repugnant to our Constitution, defamatory of our flag. We did this, apparently, because the administration believed that we had to surrender principle to convenience, because it was necessary to yield up the dignity of Americans for consideration of expediency. This degrading course of action was followed because some people thought, apparently, that it was in the best interests of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am vitally concerned about the security and defense of the United States. But I insist that there is not a single valid consideration which dictated or justified this course of action. It was expediency, nothing more nor less.

Is the base at Dhahran so essential to the defense of the United States that it must be maintained at the expense of precious human rights? Should we discriminate against our own fellow citizens by signing international agreements conceived in bigotry and born of shameful expediency? Should we accept the alibi that the security of the United States makes this base at Dhahran a vitally important one?

I deny this categorically. For the Dhahran base is not a military base.

I have the testimony of the late Secretary of State himself.

The Department of State Bulletin, August 26, 1957, page 348, quotes a remark made by Mr. Dulles during his August 6, 1956, press conference. He was asked about applying inspection procedures to bases in the Middle East. He replied:

"Answer. Well, we have no bases in the Middle East (addendum: excluding North Africa) unless you include Turkey, and that would be covered in this plan, I presume."

"Question. Dhahran?"

"Answer. That is not a military base."

"Question. Mr. Secretary, on another subject, don't you think that—"

"Answer. Excuse me. We have certain rights there but we do not—but that is not operated as a military base."

Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force, believes that " \* \* \* the

value of the Dhahran base is relatively small and that it can be replaced, but that the value of the principle involved is high and cannot be replaced." He has stated:

"There has been much unfounded talk about the 'vital' necessity of the Dhahran airfield to the interests of the United States. I think I am reasonably aware of the importance of the base structure of our Air Force and I cannot agree with the idea that any one base such as Dhahran is vital. I happen to believe that our base structure should be strengthened well beyond its present state but there are many places other than Dhahran where a substitute base for Dhahran and the additional bases which are needed could be located. I do not believe that the need for the Dhahran airbase in any way requires us to sacrifice the principles in which the American people believe."

Are we making this intolerable concession to expediency because of oil? Since oil was first discovered in Saudi Arabia, we have been warned periodically that the Arabian American Oil Co. might lose its advantageous position in Saudi Arabia unless our foreign policy conformed with that of King Saud. We heard this in 1948; we were then threatened with the loss of oil if we supported the United Nations resolution calling for the partition of Palestine. It turned out to be an empty threat then. It will always be empty as long as Saudi Arabia has no place to sell its oil except to the West and as long as oil reserves continue their enormous expansion. Saudi Arabia needs oil royalties just as much as Aramco needs oil. And let no one confuse the corporate and constitutional entities that are known as Aramco and the United States. They are not one and the same.

We will lose Saudi Arabia as an ally? This question is predicated on illusion. I seriously question whether Saudi Arabia would ever consider itself an ally of the United States. This is not the place for an extended review of our policy. But I do want to place on record my view that our Government miscalculated in 1957. At that time, there was a belief in high quarters that King Saud would embrace the Middle East doctrine, which was then under debate, and that he might become the kingpin of our Middle East policy. This was the reason for the elaborate state visit and the lavish favors conferred on Saudi Arabia at that time. But within a few months, Saudi Arabia again insisted on being neutralist. It wanted no part of the Middle East doctrine. During the 1957 Syrian crisis, Saudi Arabia's U.N. delegate lashed at the United States and the West at the United Nations in language so intemperate and shocking that our Government was constrained to ask whether he was really expressing the views of his King. Was he? We have never found out. However, anyone who thinks the United States can ever count on the King of Saudi Arabia as an ally of the United States in the cause of freedom holds a view that I think is very questionable. The King of Saudi Arabia does not believe in democracy. He is no respecter of human rights. He is a tyrannical absolute monarch who still maintains a slave market. Human rights, human dignity, human liberty for the masses of the people are as foreign to his form of totalitarianism as is the case with communism.

Let us be clear on one major point. The United States will never succeed in establishing a strong and respected policy in the Middle East unless it is prepared to demonstrate its strength—and not its weakness. I am not talking about any fleet maneuver or military parade of might—I am talking about strength of conviction and loyalty to principle. I believe—and I know that many experts on the Near East have felt this way—that the peoples of the Arab world—indeed, the peoples of Asia and Africa—will have much more respect and admiration for us if

we refuse to be deflected from our fundamental principles. Our loyalty to the guarantees of the Constitution of the United States is our great strength. When we retreat from the principle of equal citizenship for all of our citizens because of pressure from a foreign monarch who threatens to deny us airbase accommodations unless we surrender to expediency, we lose prestige and respect all over the world. The foreign policy of the United States must be made in Washington, not in any foreign capital. It must be consistent with the equality of citizenship rights of the Constitution of the United States. It should strengthen the human rights goals of the Charter of the United Nations. It must not be trimmed or tortured to fit the prejudices and passions of other governments.

But instead of strength, we have shown weakness. Once a democratic government yields and retreats before the threats of prejudice and expediency in the formulation of international agreements, it becomes less and less able to resist undesirable diplomatic pressure and it subjects itself to further and more intolerable diplomatic impositions. It is no accident that the Arab boycott against American Jews grew in intensity after the renegotiation of the Saudi Arabia base. In early 1958, the leading American Jewish organizations submitted to this body a document in which they pointed out:

"The Arab blockade and boycott of Israel has now been extended by the Arab League to a systematic boycott and blacklisting of any American enterprise that maintains permanent business connections with Israel or with Israel firms and indeed to a worldwide effort to boycott any business owned by Jews."

"The Arab League maintains a public blacklist of American and other companies that invest in Israel, maintain branches, assembly operations, or distribution outlets there, or that license patents for Israel use."

"American vessels that stop at Israel ports are denied permission to make calls at Arab ports."

"American planes that land in Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territories."

"No American is permitted to enter an Arab land from Israel except on official business."

"Americans who are Jews are a special target of the Arab boycott. Saudi Arabia, particularly, refuses to allow the Arabian-American Oil Co. or other concessionaires to employ Jews for work in Saudi Arabia. Most Arab League states refuse visas to Jewish travelers and some refuse to allow Jews to land even in transit. \* \* \*

"The Arab League has been circulating questionnaires to chambers of commerce and individual companies throughout the world inquiring whether specified companies were controlled by Jews or employed Jews. \* \* \*

"The United States has subsidized the export of wheat to (Arab) countries \* \* \* out of tax funds supplied by all our citizens. The Arab League States refuse to ship their American wheat on blacklisted vessels or to buy wheat from American exporters who are Jews or who have dealings with Israel. \* \* \* In effect, therefore, the United States submits to the operation of the Arab boycott and Americans are taxed for a wheat subsidy plan from which they are barred."

The Jewish organizations which submitted this memorandum declared:

"The Arab boycott of Americans is international intimidation; it thrives on appeasement and capitulation. We are confident that Americans deplore the Arab boycott and will want to resist this impairment of the rights and privileges of American citizenship. We are confident, too, that if the U.S. Government would strongly oppose this international blackmail and medieval bigotry, the Arab boycott against Americans inevitably would end."

"In the light of the foregoing, we, the undersigned, declare our repugnance of the Arab boycott and urge all commercial firms to resist it with every legal means at their command. At the same time, we express our firm hope that our own Government will prohibit racial or religious discrimination against American citizens in the administration of any treaties or executive agreements to which it affixes its signature."

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that my amendment is intended and designed by me to be universal in its application. I have not singled out Saudi Arabia or any other Arab country for singular or exceptional treatment. My amendment would apply to any and all foreign powers that insist on including in any international agreement with the United States discriminations between and among U.S. citizens based upon race, color, or religious faith.

It is true that the Government of Saudi Arabia has been a notorious offender in this matter because of the anti-Semitic policies toward American Jewish citizens which it has insisted must be acceded to by our Government in its international agreement with Saudi Arabia under the Dhahran airbase. However, there are other instances of discriminatory practices against certain American citizens followed by other governments, and there is the constant danger that if we surrender our ideals in respect to this principle to one nation, other nations in diplomatic negotiations may use it as a bargaining threat.

I am informed that Norway still discriminates against American citizens who may be Jesuit clergymen. My amendment would apply to that situation, as well. I understand that Iceland discriminates against American citizens who may be Negroes. My amendment would cover that situation also.

Further, let me make clear that I do not argue in support of the proposition that we have any right to interfere with the sovereign right of a foreign government to determine for itself its own domestic public policy in regard to its attitude toward the people of any particular race, color, or religious faith. What I do argue is that in exercising our sovereign rights as a democratic government based upon the constitutional guarantee of equality of citizenship, we have the duty to make clear to any foreign sovereign power that we will not enter into a treaty or executive agreement with such a government unless it is willing to grant the same rights and privileges under that agreement to all American citizens irrespective of their race, color, or religious faith.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that the time has come to stop this abject accommodation to the hatreds and hostilities of others. I do not suggest that we should try to reform the world. I know, Mr. Chairman, that we are subject to the charge that our hands are not as clean as we should like them to be. Much can be said in criticism of our own failings on the domestic scene. And I do not believe that we can use the mutual security program as an instrument whereby we will persuade other governments to revise domestic practices with respect to their own citizens which seem inequitable to us. But I do insist, Mr. Chairman, that we must always resist any policies or practices by foreign governments which create distinctions between Americans, and which deny some of our citizens rights which are accorded to others. And certainly, we should not place our blessing on such intolerable affronts by subsidizing them with grants and loans provided by American taxpayers—even, ironically, by some who are the victims of these discriminations.

The history of American diplomacy is replete with many examples of a stirring and honorable stand taken by our Government in defense of the rights of the American people regardless of their race or creed. Secretary



of State Lewis Cass declared that the object of our foreign policy is "not merely to protect a Catholic in a Protestant country, a Protestant in a Catholic country, a Jew in a Christian country, but an American in all countries." (Quoted in "American Diplomacy," by J. B. Moore, p. 135; 1905.)

In 1885, when Austro-Hungary refused to accept an American minister-designate because his wife was Jewish, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared:

"Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are imbedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.

"Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the sufferings and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever.

"It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live, can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

"Certainly it is, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments."

The United States refused at that time to support the Austro-Hungarian position. In his annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885, President Cleveland declared:

"Question has arisen with the Government of Austria-Hungary touching the representation of the United States at Vienna. Having under my constitutional prerogative, appointed an estimable citizen of unimpeachable probity and competence as Minister at that court, the Government of Austro-Hungary invited this Government to take cognizance of certain exceptions, based upon allegations against the personal acceptability of Mr. Kelley, the appointed envoy, asking that in view thereof, the appointment should be withdrawn. The reasons advanced were such as could not be acquiesced in, without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in

our Government. The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Kelley as the envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government in Vienna are now in the care of the Secretary of Legation, acting as chargé d'affaires ad interim."

In 1880 an American Jew was expelled from czarist Russia once his Jewish identity became known. This brought a sharp protest from John W. Foster, the American Minister to St. Petersburg and the grandfather of the late Secretary of State Dulles. Mr. Foster had the backing of the Department of State.

In 1908, in his speech of acceptance of the Republican nomination for the Presidency, William H. Taft noted:

"In some countries \* \* \* distinctions are made in respect to the treatment of our citizens traveling abroad and having passports of our Executive, based on considerations which are repugnant to the principles of our Government and civilization.

He committed his party and administration "to make every endeavor to secure the solution of such distinctions which in our eyes are both needless and opprobrious."

On December 15, 1911, Secretary of State Philander C. Knox notified Russia that the United States had decided to abrogate the treaty between the United States and Russia of 1832 because Russia was refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens on account of race or religion. This action of our Government was strongly approved by the Republican National Convention in 1912, and in the same year by the Democratic National Convention and the Progressive Party Convention.

I offered my amendment to the Mutual Security Act on July 8 because this is the right place for us to make our stand.

This year, the Mutual Security Act contains a new statement of purpose. We say:

"It is the sense of Congress that peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the dignity and interdependence of man, and that the survival of free institutions in the United States can best be assured in a worldwide atmosphere of expanded freedom."

If we believe this statement to be true, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should not allow a single American dollar to be used to confirm and subsidize policies which mock that high purpose.

If we believe in the dignity of man and in the survival of free institutions, and in expanding freedom, then let us back up our ideals with action which is consistent with

those ideals. Let us take our stand, once and for all, against practices which dishonor men, which deny their equality, and which subvert free institutions. Let us not vote money which perpetuates these practices and which weaken America as the leader of the free world.

The amendment I offered on the floor of the Senate was defeated by a close vote, 47 to 43. I believe that some Members of the Senate may not have been fully informed of the issue involved when the roll was called, because some who voted "no" were among the sponsors or supporters of the original Lehman amendment. Accordingly, I announced my intention of pursuing this matter further. I have been greatly encouraged by the extraordinary decision which was handed down by the Supreme Court of New York State on July 15, when the court overruled a ruling by the New York State Commission against discrimination which had allowed Aramco to question job applicants about their religion, on the ground that Jews would not be allowed to enter Saudi Arabia.

The New York State Commission had granted Aramco an exemption from the operation of New York law after our Department of State had reported to the agency that denial of an exemption might affect American policy in the Middle East.

The New York Supreme Court said:

"If the enforcement of the public policy of New York State would embarrass the State Department in the Near East, then it should be said that the honor of American citizenship—if it remains for New York State to uphold it—will survive Aramco's fall from Arab grace."

In other words, Aramco has now been told that it may not violate New York law at the behest of a foreign government. It now remains for the Congress of the United States to tell our Department of State that it must not underwrite discriminatory practices against American citizens by any foreign government. The New York Supreme Court decision may mark a decisive turning point in this unpleasant controversy. The decision struck a long overdue blow against sacrificing equal rights of citizenship for all Americans in international agreements upon the altar of unconscionable expediency. I ask this committee to take a similar position. I believe that this is the right place to make this request because we are concerned here with a measure which should strengthen not weaken U.S. foreign policy and enable our country to continue in its place of high leadership in the free world. We cannot presume to lead the free world coalition in the defense of freedom if we are parties to its subversion.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 1959

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 12, 1959)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mankind, here at the altar of Thy grace we bow seeking the renewal of our inner strength for these are troublous times and we stand in need of courage and fortitude and stability.

The world is full of the clamor of the violent, the boasting of those who trust alone in material might and the agony

of enslaved people, and we would be valiant when the hearts of many turn to water in them.

Renew, we implore Thee, our faith in Thy power and in the victory of Thy purposes and in eternal verities which outlast the noise of any turbulent day. Measure us with the global tasks of our time, that like our forefathers and foremothers we, too, strong and unafraid, may dare the wrath of demons and the scorn of godless men who have not Thee in awe.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Wednesday, August 12, 1959, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)